DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 238 418 IR 010 940

AUTHOR Braden, Roberts A.
TITLE Innovative Instructional Development in a Time of Reactionary Educational Policy.
PUB DATE 8 Mar 79
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (New Orleans, LA, March 8, 1979).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Educational Policy; *Educational Trends; Financial Support; Guidelines; *Instructional Development; *Instructional Innovation; Professional Services; *Program Development; Program Implementation

ABSTRACT

The recent conservative trend in educational policy is addressed in this paper which begins with a description of 10 specific types of threats to the instructional development movement that can evolve from an excessively conservative environment. These threats are named as follows: (1) scapegoat; (2) baby-with-the-bathwater; (3) chronological roll-back; (4) coasting uphill; (5) "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing"; (6) punish-the-learner; (7) expensive company; (8) least-cherished program; (9) smokescreen; and (10) empty barrel. Nostalgia and the back-to-basics movements are put into perspective. Suggestions are offered for ways to help instructional development survive in a reactionary environment and the psychology and politics of survival are discussed. An annotated list presents 25 survival rules which are broadly applicable to instructional development, but which are particularly appropriate during times of financially-imposed external pressures. Twenty-eight references are listed. (LMM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED238418

INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN A TIME OF REACTIONARY EDUCATIONAL POLICY

by

Roberts A. Braden

Prepared for Presentation at
AECT National Convention
New Orleans, Louisiana
March 8, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roberts A. Braden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Comments and inquiries are invited by the author. Write to:
Dr. Roberts A Braden
Instructional Development Division
133 McBryde Hall
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061

IR010940

For thirty years education has generally pursued a liberal course with only a brief pause to regroup after Sputnik. But that is the record of the recent past. Within educational circles today exists a conservative trend, perhaps even a reactionary trend. The conservatism extends to policies, programs, and prevailing attitudes. Many indicators can be cited to identify this trend. Consider, please, five selected examples. First, there is less support for the innovative--that is "the new", and, conversely, there is more support for the old--the tried and true. Second, there is less money for programs whether they be new or old. Third, there are more criticisms of students, teachers and programs--more general complaints--both from within and without the confines of education. Fourth, there are many programs being cut--either cut back in size or eliminated entirely. Fifth, there are increased pressures on both the student and the system for high performance: heightened expectations--demands, even--from the general public in regard to improving or increasing the basic results that American education can provide.

How is such a conservative trend threatening to the instructional development movement? The most obvious answer deals with the prospects of the withdrawal of financial support. However, it isn't enough to assume that low financial priority for instructional development alone will be the downfall of the movement. There are nine or ten (or more) other ways that the conservative threat to instructional development can take form. Here then is a list (not all inclusive) of some of the specific threats which can evolve from an excessively conservative environment:

1) There is the scapegoat threat. If the environment becomes repressive enough, somebody, some program, or some philosophy ultimately will take the brunt of the blame for all of the current ills in American education. Since it is unlikely that teachers or well-established programs will allow themselves to be sacrificed, it is very likely that some new program, such as instructional development, will be found to be the fall guy. There is nothing like a witch hunt to reduce the pressure upon every-day sinners.

2) Anytime reform is in the wind there is the baby with the bath water threat. This opens the whole matter of guilt by association. It is entirely possible that a "purge mentality" will develop as a reform movement goes through American education. Under those circumstances the good things can be abandoned along with the bad.

3) Looking backward can create the chronological roll-back threat. If the reformers take an attitude that "1948 looks great from here" an attempt might grow to create the 1980's as a mirror image of the late 1940's. In the process all of the improvements of three decades might be eliminated preemptively.

4) For those of us who tend to become complacent there is the coasting uphill threat. Loss of momentum can mean loss of support. If an innovative program such as instructional development is restrained too long--does not press forward--it loses its glitter. The picture of instructional development as a force standing still is one of a concept stripped of its charisma. Should that happen, the people who ordinarily would support the idea might very well turn to some other new idea--one with vitality and some promise of excitement.

5) There is the "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing" treat. Partial knowledge is threatening because a reform group knowing a little bit about instructional development might either expect too much from the process or might not realize all that the process can contribute. In either case there can develop a discrepancy between the expectations of the reformers and the delivered results of the ID program. An attempt to make results coincide with misguided expectations could easily end in an educational disaster from which ID would never recover.

6) Consider, too, the punish-the-learners threat. One reactionary way of thinking holds that educators should make it hard for students to learn. The underlying assumption is that students made to suffer will appreciate their knowledge once the agony of learning has passed. Because properly implemented ID tends to make learning easier, not harder, a punish-the-learner movement could well spell the death of instructional development.

7) We should not forget the expensive company threat. There is an old cliché that you are judged by the company you keep. In this regard instructional developers might be linked with costly hardware and highly sophisticated innovations which are not necessarily at the heart of their programs. Once instructional development becomes identified as part of a frivolous fringe--merely frosting on the cake--it can expect to be sacrificed to the gods of austerity.

8) There is also the least-cherished-program threat. It is not unlikely that our very clients--the faculty--may become instructional development's executioner. If there must be a cutback in staff, and if a

collegial decision is involved in determining who must go. . . . Well, be honest. Do you expect that teaching positions or research positions would normally be sacrificed before service positions? They may love us. The question will be, do they love us enough?

9) If you understand politics, you will recognize the smokescreen threat. If the pressure from the reactionary trend becomes too great, it is possible that some faddish non-solution will be advanced that strikes the fancy of academia. It is well known that the educational system loves the status quo. Thus, we could see ID programs robbed of their substance in order to provide 100 percent support for ineffective, non-threatening programs--programs that put no real pressure upon the status quo.

10) Finally, there is the "empty barrel" threat. This is about where we started. Lack of financial support can spell the doom of instructional development and of many other things in American education. This is true whether low financial priority is assigned to instructional development or not. When the money crunch becomes severe enough, all peripheral programs will go.

PROPOSITION 13 MENTALITY

Is the public angry? The answer obviously is yes. The next question then is, why? There seems to be no single answer to that question. The two most frequently advanced responses are: 1) taxes! (the "Proposition 13 Movement" is at its heart a middle-income tax revolt) and, 2) there is general dissatisfaction with government programs at all levels: national, state, and local. Due to the general disaffection, even the citizens who are not economically a part of the middle-income group have become the

voting allies of the middle-income taxpayers on this particular issue. In some localities, the tax revolt movement has taken on almost a religious fervor. This zealousness--this crusading spirit--has led me to label the prevailing public attitude as "Proposition 13 Mentality." Although most of the elements for a genuine reform movement are present, no central personality has yet emerged to lead the way. Without leadership the pressure of public discontent will remain--probably only as an agitating force. Even so, it will be an agitating force we can ill afford to ignore.

What is being done about Proposition 13 mentality? Well, most of the action has been reaction. We have seen the death of a few programs that were not strongly institutionalized and which were not anchored in a true power base. We have also seen federal tax relief to high-income individuals and to low-income taxpayers. Whether or not the paradox of this tax relief pattern has been intentional (to isolate the middle-income taxpayer from his temporary voting allies) is conjectural. However, because governmental reactions to date have generally been pointed at other than the most dissident group, it is unlikely that the pressure which initiated the Proposition 13 movement is going to go away anytime soon.

As an isolated group, middle-income taxpayers lack political clout. Eventually they may lose some of their broad-based support. The temptation, then, is to say, why worry? Beware! We must avoid the temptation to be so nonchalant. Consider, please, the point of attack. The focus of the middle-income taxpayer revolt has been upon the property tax. It is a fact of life that most property tax dollars go toward education. As long as the property tax is the revenue source that is most heatedly under fire--regardless of the reasons, regardless of the degree of popular support for the attack--education must be sorely concerned.

It's easy for us all to recognize that a problem exists. The most critical question is, how do we deal with Proposition 13 mentality? If there were a single most appropriate strategy, we would have heard it by now. Perhaps (probably), lacking a monolithic solution, we must find a composite approach. Thus we may end up collectively generating a long list of mini-strategies--maybe a hundred or more--each of which will contribute to an overall satisfactory solution. For example, the following are some of the kinds of things that we might do to help instructional development survive in an era of Proposition 13 mentality.

1) We in ID should try not to get lost whenever there is a shift from local to state or federal financing.

2) We should be ready to operate on less money. (If you're already on a zero budget, forgive me.)

3) We should be prepared to make greater effort to identify and obtain outside money.

4) We should be cost effective.

5) As the situation becomes more political, we should become better politicians.

6) We should compile an extensive and ever-expanding list of survival ideas. The list at the end of this article could be a starter. Then we should honor those ideas by implementing every item of good practice from the list which is appropriate to our local program.

If you think that Proposition 13 doesn't affect you; if you think that California schools are in trouble, but things are fine in your state; think again. Compare the results of the 1974 Gallup Poll with those of

1978 (Elam, 1978). The natives are restless. Consider things like a wire service item that claims teenagers, ". . . are simply refusing to do the work that leads to learning." (Bardo, 1979). Ask yourself why AECT is marketing a book, Crisis! The Taxpayer Revolt and Your Kid's Schools. McLuhan (1964) may have predicted a world in which the test score decline was inevitable, but that doesn't mean the American public will accept those results.

Even if all of your fellow citizens are happy with the status of local education, there are good reasons to cautiously re-examine the level of your optimism. Of those of you who have been paying attention to recent history, who would deny the following?

- We have just had two decades of "good times" to obscure our perception of the present and our view of the future.
- In real dollars (purchasing power), soft money (grants from government and industry) to sponsor educational innovation is at or near a post-Sputnik low. Even the dollars that still flow are diminished in value by costs of governmental constraints. (Administratively it costs more to spend each of the scarcer dollars.)
- All indicators suggest that the soft money situation will get worse before it gets better.
- In the days of milk and honey--the days of free-flowing educational money--mountains of public money were spent frivously. The supreme measure of grantsmanship was the number of dollars that could be passed through the system. Meaningful results were

too often of secondary importance. Now, only a few years later, the entire educational community suffers with a frivolous reputation and a severe loss of credibility.

THE SPECIAL CASE OF THE GOOD-OLD-DAYS MOVEMENT

"I remember when. . . ." "Things were better before. . ." "Back in the good old days. . . ." "Well, the way it used to be. . . ." "About the time of the Korean War, things were different. . . ."

Nostalgia! We are all its victims. Memory plays tricks on us. The past is filled with pleasures and virtues because that is the way that most of us want to remember it. Come to think of it, things weren't so bad, 'way back when. However, the unequivocable notion that the past was better than the present is nonsense. It is a myth--a myth of our own making.

We know more about the teaching-learning process now than ever before. The teachers today are better qualified than ever. The students in today's classrooms are learning things that were undreamed of only a decade ago. Students are learning different things than they did when earlier generations attended school, and that is part of the problem. If Mom and Dad both were required to memorize the names of the states and their capitals, they may wonder as parents why that task has been skipped for young Johnny and Jenny. And some things are not taught the same way they once were. For the parent who cannot forget (i.e., fondly remembers) his experience reading Moby Dick in the eighth grade (or was it the sixth?), a curriculum that offers his daughter an experience watching a film with Gregory Peck as A. b may seem unsatisfactory.

When uninformed or misinformed parents and other citizens bring a nostalgia movement to bear upon the schools, the defense is simple. Governing boards, parents, and other interested parties are delighted to learn the good news about modern educational systems. The foggy memories of the past cannot stand the sunshine of current facts.

The problem is not so simple, however, when the issue is really one of simplicity versus complexity. That is, when an individual or group begins to campaign for a return to the good old days because they are looking for simplicity in a complex world, trouble is at hand. The seeds of despotism grow well in the soil that rejects the complexity of a process or institution. Moreover, should such a campaign infect the faculty, too, the probable result would be courses composed only of lectures, essay tests, and term papers--all graded on a curve with the whole routine done almost exactly the way the teacher's teacher did it a generation ago. Under the influence of such a mood there would be no alternative learning modes offered or tolerated, because the thrust would be to simplify teaching, not learning.

When we talk about the advocates of those good-old-times, we should at least mention the tendency of individuals and groups to sometimes refuse to accept reality. For example, when we decide that we simply do not want to think about or recognize the existence of a test score decline we also can eliminate all concern for developmental learning. While in that frame of mind, why not ignore grade inflation as well? And certainly let's scrub all thoughts of discipline problems. It's easy. We just wish ourselves back to a time before those problems existed.

Actually, this latter sort of mental gymnastics might very well warrant our encouragement. A brief fantasy trip never hurt anyone, and when the illusion fades the problems of the present are more apparent than ever.

BACK-TO-BASICS

An interesting spin-off of the nostalgia syndrome has gained its own label, back-to-basics.

Standing in opposition to the idea of back-to-basics could be somewhat hazardous. The vision of Scrooge comes to mind--an ill-tempered person casting humbugs right and left--the one opponent of Christmas. Surely we wouldn't want to be the lone opponent of "basics". Indeed, what is wrong with "basics"? Nothing, so far as this author can tell! The troublesome problem lies in definitions and hidden meanings. What is meant by "back-to"? And exactly what is included in "basics"?

There isn't any official definition of "basic", but the term has wide acceptance as a modern day synonym for the 3R's. The American public is upset over reports of test score declines, "illiterate" high school graduates, and similar reports of failures by the schools to effectively teach reading, writing, and mathematics.

The problem is not a simple one. The schools never stopped teaching the 3R's, although those subjects are certainly taught in a different way than they were a few years ago. There is a matter of emphasis involved--how much greater emphasis should be given to basic subjects, and at the expense of what other subjects? Science? Art? And there is the only

slightly hidden agenda which surfaces when parents speak of their specific concerns about our schools--discipline. There is much more, but this is not the place for it.

The clear problem for the instructional developer is posed by the possibility that the comments will progress from "Where did we go wrong?" to "Things are such a mess, let's just start over!" or "Let's go back to the way they taught it when we were in school." That would not be back-to-basics. That would be basically backward. An educational program for the 1920's, or 30's, or 40's, or whenever, will not fit the 1980's. The social system has changed, and there is so much more knowledge at our disposal that we must approach it differently.

The problem may be complex, but the broad task is simple. Teachers, with the help of instructional developers and others, must make sure that the students learn the basic subjects. The concept stretches across all levels of education. Teaching will receive less criticism as evidence of learning increases, and in this context the more useful the learning, the better.

THE FIRST RULE OF SURVIVAL: TAKE WHAT THE PROFESSION HAS TO OFFER

(Don't re-invent the wheel. Get help. Consult the literature. Apply any applicable research results.)

When survival of your job, your program, or your professional career is at stake, it may be difficult to overcome a feeling of being alone--odd person out, so to speak. Logic will tell you better. Generalized problems have their prophets who foretell the troubled times. As a result, potential antidotes are usually being sought before the disease becomes epidemic.

A concern for survival is not new in the field of education. Five years and more ago Diamond saw the handwriting on the wall. He shared his concern with those who would listen. He went so far as to title an AVI article, "Academic Redesign in Higher Education: A Matter of Survival." (Diamond, 1975). Similarly, the American Association for Higher Education published Stewart and Harvey's (1975) book, Strategies for Significant Survival. Lindquist (1975) linked a solution to the survival problem with the observation that, "survival for many colleges and universities comes down to effective teaching." There have been a variety of reasons that forward looking professionals, early on, were concerned with the spectre of survival. Yet, not every survival-conscious futurist has foretold doomsday. Martin (1975) noted that, "In some cases, sheer survival may be at stake; in most cases survival without sacrifice of quality will be the issue."

More recently attention has turned toward prescriptive solutions. The two most helpful that have come to the attention of this writer are both by Dean Spitzer. The first of these takes the form of an iconoclastic list of "Selections from a Survival Manual for Instructional Developers" (Spitzer, 1977a). There are twenty-six items on that list ranging from common sense ("band together"), through sneaky ("do to administrators what they do to us. . ."), to inspired ("learn to do well tasks that nobody else is capable of doing."). Next, Spitzer (1977b) published the results of a survey of ID personnel and other educational technologists. The result was a list of sixty-six "incentives" that can be used to encourage faculty to engage in instructional development. Although these

are not survival tips in a pure sense, the first prerequisite to ID survival is an active clientele. Spitzer's list, if applied, will help any developer recruit clients and thus further entrench his/her ID program. A breakdown of the incentives for faculty shows:

- Twelve Direct Incentives

  (Things like mini-grants and released time--up-front inducements or REWARDS for attempting ID)

- Thirty-Three Organizational Facilitation Incentives

  (Things that help cut red tape or reduce the hassle and confusion for faculty)

- Fourteen Recognition Incentives

  (Things like awards and publicity for ID achievement.)

- Seven Personal Satisfactions

  (Intrinsic incentives and personal/professional growth factors such as improved communication.)

There is an old adage about sticking with a winner. Nothing guarantees success, but knowing what has succeeded in the past is a good place to start when planning the future. For that reason, the recent research of Lawrason (1978) is very valuable. Lawrason identified eight factors commonly reported in the literature that historically have contributed to ID success. There is every reason to believe these same factors will contribute to future ID successes as well.

1. Commitment by the Institution
2. Faculty Rewards
3. Skills of the ID Staff
4. Resources and Facilities
5. Evaluation of Programs

6. Faculty Openness to Change
7. Student Attitudes
8. Focus (emphasis) of the ID Center

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SURVIVAL

The attitudes of the instructional developer toward current instructional development processes and toward the prospects for ID in the future are extremely important to the ongoing health of the ID program. We must keep our spirits up--even if our budget is down. We must think innovatively even as we retrench. We must not become preoccupied with a few reverses, because they are insignificant compared to our many gains. We must take the optimist's view that every cloud has its silver lining.

Using the latest idiom, even the bad news is good news. Accountability, for example, will foster evaluation, feedback, and hopefully will bring about increased efficiency in instruction. That's pretty good news. Back-to-basics will provide opportunities for instructional developers to influence curriculum revision and could easily encourage serious front-end analysis as a preliminary step in instructional design. That, too, is pretty good news. Further, adversity is known as the mother of invention. As we in the field of educational technology cope with the dynamics of a conservative era, our forced introspection will ultimately become a catalyst for exciting new work. When that happens, it will certainly be welcomed as good news--good news for instructional development and good news for the educational system.

On the bright side, several very good things have happened recently or are now happening that we should use to buoy our spirits. I would like

to mention five of these "happenings" that I view as positive indicators for ID survival.

First, although Erickson (1978) gives evidence that publish-or-perish pressure is increasing rather than declining, there is a concurrent renewed interest in college teaching. The rash of outstanding new books that deal with college teaching is heartwarming indeed--particularly since the current crop tend to draw heavily upon learning theory, systems theory, and other modern psychological principles. Without making an extensive literature search, the following examples come to mind: Davis, Teaching Strategies for the College Classroom (1976);Eble, The Craft of Teaching (1976); Scholl and Inglis, Teaching in Higher Education (1977); Kozma, Belle and Williams, Instructional Techniques in Higher Education (1978); McKeachie, Teaching Tips (1978); and Milton, On College Teaching (1978).

Second, the launching of the Journal of Instructional Development, JID, is a very special happening for the members of our field. As a forum for theorists and practitioners JID is invaluable. As a communication medium within the field, JID should become evermore valuable in the next few years. Already JID has shown that it can lead the way in developing and reporting the issues of our field. For example, an important precursor of this article was the comparative presentations of Gustafson and Silber at the 1978 AECT convention. Many of us missed the session, but JID brought both sides of the issue (Gustafson, 1978) (Silber, 1978) to its readers.

Third, we can look with some measure of reassurance to the situation in America's community colleges. The conservative crunch has been a fact

of life in the community colleges for the past three or four years. I know of one community college that abolished the program that included its instructional development effort. However, that one abandoned ID program never had firm roots in the first place. There may be other non-survivors. Probably there are, but they have not come to my attention. Meanwhile, I also know of many community college ID programs that are surviving!

Fourth, the literature for and about educational technology and instructional development becomes more complete all of the time. Works like AECT's Educational Technology: Definition and Glossary of Terms, Vol. 1, (1977) will have a pervasive impact upon ID for several years. (Vol. II has been written but as of this writing has not been edited.) The periodic literature of ID is becoming quite strong, and a variety of books on instructional design and development are beginning to appear. For example, the following recent works would be useful additions to any ID reference shelf, and they should be truly useful to the beginning developer: Briggs, Instructional Design: Principles and Applications (1977), Langdon, et al., The Instructional Design Library (20 vols.) (1978), Bass and Lumsden, Instructional Development: The State of the Art (1978), and Dick and Carey, The Systematic Design of Instruction (1978).

Fifth, Proposition 13 may have been a catastrophe to some programs in California. However, it was a well publicized event, and therein lies its great value. The mood of the voters that brought about Proposition 13 is real. It isn't going to go away soon. We are all alert to the danger now, and we can use our instincts to "dig in" before it is too late.

Also, even though they may not be happy about the role, our colleagues in California are breaking ground for the rest of us in the other 49 states. We can observe the successes and failures in California and set our own strategies accordingly. Thank you, California.

THE POLITICS OF SURVIVAL

In a sense, everything that we do for the sake of program survival is an integral part of the politics of survival. We all find that these times call for some expenditure of effort polishing our image, cultivating support, and reducing our vulnerability to the incursions of both empire builders and reformists. Call it something else if you wish, but it is also politics. A political act of survival can be rather trivial. Thus, if, wishing to appear cost conscious, you initiate an office policy to print all worksheets and other student materials on both sides of the sheet of paper, you are playing survival politics.

On a more grandiose scale, the important thing to remember about survival politics is that the nature of the political climate sets the tone for any action we might take. The fact that instructional development by its very nature causes change to take place in instruction is important in this context. Change is a liberal activity in a political sense. Innovation, one of the inevitable by-products of instructional development, is a radically liberal activity in a political sense. When the political climate is conservative, as it is becoming at this time, instructional developers are confronted with a difficult dilemma. How, without abandoning all that is worthwhile in the ID process, do we appear to be in step with the times? How do we seem not to be on a collision course with the political heartbeat?

Sam Rayburn is frequently quoted as the originator of the political slogan, "Go along and get along." For the instructional developer, it is excellent advice half of the time (during times of retrenchment). Please note that it is easy to become confused about the go along/get along truism. Protesting, rebelling, disagreeing, etc., were "in" practices a decade ago. In 1969 protesting was "going along." In 1979 it is not. Today a different kind of "going along" is appropriate, and it may very well imply "supporting the establishment." In case you are not convinced, decide for yourself the outcome of the following situation:

Hypothetically, in spring practice the coach of a pro football team tells his five potential quarterbackers, who are all about equally skilled, that he wants to emphasize the ground game this year. Later, in several exhibition games, quarterback Smith repeatedly passes on first down. Question: When the coach must make final pre-season cuts to his roster of players, which quarterback will be dropped from the team?

Lawrason and Hedberg's (1979) closing remark in a report of a research project that attempts to identify precise success factors in relation to ID projects was:

> Until such time as instructional development receives both academic and political status within higher education, the developer. . . must work within the existing campus structure if he or she is to have an effect upon improving or changing instructional practices.

Translation: go along and get along.

THE DETAILS OF SURVIVAL:
Suggestions, Rules-of-Thumb, and Straws-to-be-Grasped in an Attempt to Survive

The do's and dont's of survival change according to the times and the particular crisis. But there is something reassuring about even an

entirely outdated list of tips for survival. Take for example some of the rules for the aviator of 1920 as quoted by Filip (1975).

- Don't take the machine into the air unless you are satisfied it will fly.
- If you see another machine near you, get out of its way.
- Pilots will not wear spurs while flying.
- If an emergency occurs while flying, land as soon as you can.

Out of date by nearly sixty years, these old warnings evoke a grin. It's as if wisdom has been transposed into humor. Look more deeply, however, and you will agree that the wisdom is still there. Survival rules are mostly obvious things. The list that follows is a conglomeration of aphorisms and intuition plus other tidbits from the realm of conventional wisdom. The list includes advice from the gurus of the field and heuristics from the research and the literature. Nothing on the list is unconditionally recommended because everything on the list would be wrong for somebody.

It is recommended that anyone concerned with the survival of an instructional development program give consideration to these and other ideas in search of a survival formula for their circumstances.

Know your business. Nobody wants to consult a jackleg operator. Admittedly, knowing the business doesn't mean you know it all. Instructional development is a complex field that draws upon all of the knowledge of instructional technology. Like the medical general practitioner, you will need to know when, where, and how to make referrals.

Have a plan. Know where you and your program are going. Know how you plan to get there. Have identifiable short range goals. Decide

how you will know you are succeeding. (Use that famous systems approach to provide a set of local strategies for survival.)

Be flexible on the issues. Change ourselves to meet the demands of our times (Gustafson, 1978). Avoid situations where our values reduce our effectiveness. This applies to both our interactions with fellow developers and with clients. Thus, consider as examples these guidelines for only two of many controversial situations: 1) Don't get caught up in an internecine fight amongst instructional developers over placing emphasis as a developer upon interpersonal skills versus technical skills. Do develop both sets of skills. Most survivors will. 2) With clients, don't take an unyielding position on learner-based versus teacher-based approaches. Do know the relative merits of both approaches and be prepared to consult and to suggest without becoming an advocate whose ideas are threatening to faculty.

Know where you stand. (Better yet, understand where you stand.) Approach ID like a good player would approach a high stakes poker game:

> Know your resources. Know your strengths. Know your weaknesses. Know the players. Know the rules of the game. Know the stakes. Bet 'em when you've got 'em, but know you've got 'em before you bet 'em. Never bluff if you can't afford to be called, etc.

If you prepare and act in these ways, you probably won't overreach, get caught napping, miss an opportunity, or make a silly faux pas. ID is often a risk-taking venture, but you should always act from

knowledge. Controlled risk is the name of the game, and high probability of success is what we seek. If survival is our goal, we cannot afford to recklessly gamble with the future of our programs by making uninformed decisions.

Account for accountability. Understand the purposes of documentation and know how to use the results to best advantage. An accountability craze is the perfect environment for promoting the evaluation component of instructional devleopment. Stress to your clients that the processes we recommend will help them account. Be sensitive to whether your case calls for counting or accounting. Remember that the world is full of people who love numbers and would like to quantify everything. Knowing "how many" may be the survival key: How many students? How many projects? How many dollars (spent, saved. . .)? How many faculty members served? How many courses? How many modules? How many services offered? I don't know how many how many's there are, but a great many, at least.

Be accountable. (a) We should be accountable whether it is demanded of us or not. That may let us set the rules for accounting rather than having someone else impose standards and procedures which we may not like. (b) We should use the accountability system to promote effective and efficient projects. The need to account can be converted into an opportunity to do some necessary bragging (on our clients, our program, our staff, or some combination thereof.

Be basic. Seek projects that support improvement and revitalization of basic programs and subjects. Join forces with those who are charged

with developmental learning. The public has decided that our children should be able to read, write, and solve basic math problems. Let others indulge in rock throwing because students are performing below expectation levels. The role of instructional developers is to help with learning problems.

Do more. With luck we will have the opportunity to do more of the right things. Also, we might consider taking on some of those tasks that nobody really wants to do themselves. Would anybody of sound mind want to "fire" their garbage man--or even their paper carrier, so long as the garbage gets picked up weekly and the paper gets left daily?

Deliver on your promises. Don't promise anything you cannot deliver (Silber, 1978). There is usually something that you confidently can offer to do for a client, so don't stop making promises. Instead, establish a reputation for making and keeping promises.

Adjust to the needs of our clients. (Bass, 1978) Faculty are also concerned with survival--their own. If a dean (principal) somewhere expresses a liking for slide shows, we may have a run of slide show clients. Don't be surprised if, for example, faculty development seems to warrant more attention for awhile than curriculum revision. To borrow a mercantile phrase, if you have it in stock, supply that which is in demand.

Make more allies. Make more of the right allies, too. The developer's daily work is largely with teachers, but administrators are always looking for ways they can help the teaching effort. If you can convince them that helping you helps teaching, you will get a lot of support. The corollary to making allies is to avoid making

enemies. There is no such thing as a safe enemy.

Choose your battlegrounds. Be known as the person who carried forward a campaign for converting a large wasted space into a student learning lab--not as the crank who raised a stink over who should have the key to a storage closet. Try to be for things rather than against. In conservative times be more selective in your innovations. Don't stop being innovative, just limit your risk taking. (Make everybody happy--innovate when it isn't controversial and when an outside agency will pick up the tab.)

Cut corners. Particularly don't repeat another instructional developer's work unless there is no alternative (e.g., "borrow" computer simulation software rather than program it yourself.) Adapt rather than merely adopt, but be certain to "personalize" the product for your client in the process.

Spread the cost. Share your ID results with others. Join an informal working group of developers who are cooperating with each other or lead your institution into a formal consortium. Promote inter-disciplinary projects so that several departments are jointly bearing the burden of both manpower and financial costs. Remember that labor can often be substituted for money. By spreading the work you can frequently reduce the budget.

Be alert for new outlets for ID. Instructional development has now found a place in K-12 programs, community colleges, four-year colleges and universities, medical education, technical education, business and industrial training, continuing education, ungraded education, mass

education, and other non-traditional educational efforts. In a time of retrenchment your program may be able to expand its base of support or to draw strength from neighboring ID activities.

Avoid being the victimized innocent bystander. It would be very difficult to find a school or university administrator anywhere who opposes effective teaching, improved courses, increased learning, or any of the other positive things we instructional developers hope to bring about. It would be equally difficult to find parents and other citizens who would resist the idea of using the best known procedures to help students learn. ID tries to make that happen. We should be the heroes, then, with nothing to fear. Right? Sorry, but that is wrong. When the shrapnel flies, everyone has something to fear. Proposition 13 provides the perfect example. An acquaintance of mine who coordinates staff and professional development in the California community college system recently told me about a post election analysis of California voter opinions. The analysis revealed that 55% of Californians thought Proposition 13 would clean up "that welfare problem." The educational system in California seems to be, at least in part, an innocent bystander wounded by a public salvo fired at welfare.

Demystify and clarify. The middle of a reduction in force is the wrong time for people to be wondering what we do. It is also the wrong time to have them asking, "what's going on?" Although we may tire of doing so, we must continue to tell our constituents about the miracles we are prepared to perform. We also should use our good offices to help clarify instructional issues such as the one which surrounds the

grading of mastery learning approaches. We need not become either an advocate or an opponent of grade escalation (or any other issue). Rather, we can be a calm and informed force contributing to rational instructional decisions.

Accentuate the Positive. There are a number of ways that calling attention to positive results can benefit a besieged program. A positive attitude is an immeasurable asset--particularly when everybody else is doom-saying. Should your building catch fire, you can report that the North wing was destroyed (negative) or you can report that the South wing was saved (positive). Orient your program around the things that can be done rather than continually be reacting to the things that cannot.

Document your work. Documentation is a secret weapon in the reward structure war. It can be used by the client as evidence to peers and administrators (not bad), but maybe more important for us, it can be currency which is coin of the realm--facts, figures and other data which can be the substance of academic publication. (VERY GOOD). Obviously, documentation is also potentially useful so that we may defend our failures and herald our successes.

Promote ID in your own way. There isn't any textbook solution to the promotion of instructional development. The approach you select should be suitable to the context of your idiosyncratic environment. Promote your program, though, or nobody will.

Be political, but be careful. The internal politics of the academic world have already been discussed. How about the larger world of politics? The most important decisions about education in America

are made in the political arena rather than at the schoolhouse. Therefore, if we wish to influence those decisions we must be political. However, as a change agent being political means knowing when to be highly visible (when facts are needed) and when to be virtually invisible (when controversy rages). The only safe political role that we may play from within the system is one of persuasion. Once we yield to the temptation to seek the power of politics, whether internal or external, we are courting trouble. Lawrason (1978) wisely concluded, "To give too much power to a change agent appears to threaten both faculty and administration."

Don't over-react. Remember the story of Chicken Little. An acorn may fall or the roof may cave in, but the sky is not falling. The difference, of course, is important. If we take time to assess the damage we can eventually rebuild the roof--maybe better than ever. Keep telling yourself, "Don't Panic." To panic is to give up, to accept a position of hopelessness. Remember, it is not Armegeddon (yet), and acting as if it were would only accelerate the deterioration of the situation. The young people have a phrase which is very good general advice for survival: keep cool.

Don't get discouraged. After busting your hump to help the teachers in your institution you may expect that they will applaud your efforts. It may not be a realistic expectation. Speaking of institutions of higher education, Lawrason (1978) states very clearly an old premise. He reminds us of an old lament of educational technologists and others who seek change in American education:

> . . . it is not uncommon to find that the priorities and procedures of the academic community and of the administrative structure conflict with those of individuals who are seriously concerned with improving the quality of instruction.

The most important thing to note about that sad commentary is that it is not a new phenomenon. The faculty members who go into the classrooms have a different set of motivators than those of the instructional developer. The same is true of chain-of-command administrators. The happy thought which we must hold is that some of the faculty members and administrators are totally in accord with our views. At our lowest moment one of those individuals will surely come forward to reinforce our battered egos.

Be your own most severe critic. Ask yourself the sticky questions about your own ID program. Some of these tough questions (e.g., Who sets the goals of ID?) have been laid out by Braden and Terrell (1978), but the really sticky questions are the ones with a local flavor. Most of these toughest of all queries go something like this, "Why is such-and-such the way that it is?" If you don't know the answer, find out. If you don't like the answer, try to change it.

Seek answers even if you don't know the questions. None of us has all of the questions, and most of us lack answers for some of the questions that we have. Then, too, there are the partial answers--the incomplete solutions. This paper is an example. It only partially answers the questions related to ID in a time of reactionary educational policy. It offers a very incomplete solution to the survival problem. The responses need polishing and the attempt to collect the pieces of the solution needs to be continued. Each reader must provide his/her

own final set of answers and should continue collecting additions to these lists until (s)he is personally satisfied with the resulting strategies for survival.

REFERENCES

AECT Task Force on Definition and Terminology. Educational technology: definition and glossary of terms. Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communication and Technology, 1977.

Bardo, P. Kids spurn studies and teachers quit. Roanoke Times & World News, February 11, 1979, p. F-3.

Bass, R. K. The future of instructional development. DID Newsletter, July 1978, 9(1), 3.

Bass, R. K., and Lumsden, D. Barry (Eds.). Instructional development: the state of the art. Columbus, Ohio: Collegiate Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Braden, R. A., and Terrell, W. R. The challenge from within: some unpopular views of instructional development topics. In R. K. Bass and D. Barry Lumsden (Eds.), Instructional development: the state of the art. Columbus, Ohio: Collegiate Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Briggs, Leslie J. (Ed.). Instructional design: principles and applications. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1977.

Davis, James R. Teaching strategies for the college classroom. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1976.

Diamond, R. M. Academic redesign in higher education: a matter of survival. Audiovisual Instruction, 1974, 19(10), 6-8.

Dick, Walter, and Carey, Lou. The systematic design of instruction. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1978.

Eble, Kenneth. The craft of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Elam, Stanley M. (Ed.). A decade of Gallup polls of attitudes toward education 1969-1978. Bloomington, In.: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1978.

Ericksen, Stanford C. The dimensions of merit. Memo to the faculty. 61, December, 1978, 5.

Filep, R. T. Learning, technology, and the potential increase of productivity in higher education. In S. A. Harrison & L. M. Stolurow (Eds.), Improving instructional productivity in higher education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1975.

Gustafson, K. The future of instructional development--through the looking glass darkly. Journal of instructional development, 1978, 2(1), 2-5.

Langdon, Danny G. (Ed.) The instructional design library (20 vols.) Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1978.

Lawrason, Robert E. Politics of instructional development in higher education. In R. Bass and D. Barry Lumsden (Eds.) Instructional development: the state of the art. Columbus, Ohio: Collegiate Publishing, Inc., 1978.

Lawrason, Robin E. and John G. Hedberg, Instructional development projects in higher education: predicting success. Journal of Instructional Development, 2 (2), Winter 1978-79, 32-38.

Kozma, Robert B., Belle, Lawrence W., and Williams, George W. Instructional techniques in higher education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publicatios, 1978.

Lindquist, J. Institutional services for teaching improvement. In C. T. Stewart and T. R. Harvey (Eds.), Strategies for significant survival. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

Martin, E. P. Innovative programs and curricula. In C. T. Stewart and T. R. Harvey (Eds.), Strategies for significant survival. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching tips (seventh ed.) Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Co., 1978.

McLuhan, Marshall, Understanding media: extensions of man. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1964.

Milton, Ohmer, and Associates. On college teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Scholl, Stephen C., and Inglis, Sandra Cheldelin (Eds.). Teaching in higher education. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Board of Regents, 1977.

Silber, K. H. Instructional development: deliverance. Journal of Instructional Development, 1978, 2(1), 2-5.

Spitzer, Dean. R. Selections from a survival manual for instructional developers. Audiovisual Instruction, 1977, 22(8), 54-55.

_____. Incentives in instructional development. Educational Technology, 17(8), 17-21.

Stewart, C. T., and Harvey, T. R. (Eds.). Strategies for significant survival. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1975.